

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\* \* \*

STEPHEN LAForge and BUNNY  
LAForge,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RICHLAND HOLDINGS, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 17-cv-00782-APG-VCF

**ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION OF  
TIME TO FILE AMENDED  
COMPLAINT**

(ECF No. 72)

The plaintiffs' motion to extend time to file their amended complaint (**ECF No. 72**) is **GRANTED**. While counsel's car accident is truly unfortunate, it appears the underlying cause of this delay is that counsel's office has undertaken more work than it can handle. I agree with defendants that better planning and fewer commitments may have avoided yet another problem for counsel. Nevertheless, in order to avoid harming the plaintiffs because of their counsel's issues, I am granting the motion.

Moreover, while I understand the defendants' frustrations with the repeated delays caused by the plaintiffs' counsel, a delay of one business day in the filing of the amended complaint has no significant negative impact upon the defendants. The plaintiffs' counsel has granted the defendants extensions when requested. I remind all counsel about Local Rule 1-1(c): "The court expects a high degree of professionalism and civility from attorneys. There should be no difference between an attorney's professional conduct when appearing before the court and when engaged outside it, whether in discovery or any other phase of a case." I also warn the plaintiffs' counsel that future extensions will not be granted absent extraordinary circumstances.

DATED this 2nd day of July, 2018.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ANDREW P. GORDON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE